

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/882,222

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Louis Falasco

Art Unit

1773

All Participants:(1) Louis Falasco.(2) Jane E. Gennaro.**Status of Application:** allowed

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: _____**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1


Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner pointed out that as applicants have argued, that while molded manufactured articles encompassing hydrophobic or hydrophilic monomers presently claimed have been known, as evident from the prior art citations, there is no suggestion to have these as the forming or molding surface itself for the release of rubber latex. I was agreed to better define the claims as directed to a mold or former having the claimed monomers as the forming or molding surface itself for the release of rubber latex. .